

Tok: subjective nature of perspective in arts and science

[Environment](#), [Nature](#)



Knowledge Issue: To what extent may the subjective nature of perception be regarded as an advantage for artists but an obstacle to be overcome by scientists? A person who produces paintings or drawings as a profession or hobby is called an Artist. All artists have a way to express their art works. These expressions are usually recognized by different kinds of perspectives. One of the most common ways used to evaluate art works is through the subjective nature of perspective. When it comes to the word subjective, the relation of thoughts is automatically based on or influenced by personal feelings, tastes, or opinions.

Now, most artists take this technique as an advantage of manipulating/ provoking the viewers' mind into liking their painting or any kind of artworks based on their the personal tastes. The one thing that helps them understand of the public interest is by generalization. We all know that opinions are mostly personal. But when it comes to society, our personal opinions do not really matter in the public eye. The only few opinions that are accepted into the social world are the ones set by the policy makers of society.

These perspectives are mostly advertised through television or any kind of social networks that heeds the public. For this reason alone, people are blindly attracted by the ' social magnet' to follow this so-called social quo. Without realizing, we as social butterflies, stand under the one who controls our strings in society. This functions perfectly for Artists, since they have the advantage to create the ultimate theme or setting for certain periods of time in society with the help of their subjective nature of perspective.

This is proven over time; Artists have created themes that develop from renaissance to abstract, to pop art, to post-modern art that we have today. Sometimes, some artists may decide to create something that no one else seems to understand, but somehow got through in society. For example, in 1917, Marcel Duchamp signed a urinal with fake initials of “ R. Mutt” and placed it in a museum. Without any particular reason it became so popular in the public eye.

One of the most probable reasons for this is because most people observe his ‘ artwork’ through the subjective nature of perspective, rather than combining it with the objective nature of perspective. As one opinion is made, it is then spread all over society causing people to believe that this subjective opinion is the one they should have, hence the domino effect. However, the subjective nature of perspective also has a way of becoming an obstacle for some groups in society. One group that struggles with this subjective nature of perspective is the Scientists.

Scientists are people who are studying or have expert knowledge of one or more of the natural or physical sciences. Scientists have a hard time with the subjective nature of perspective, because most of their observations and analysis is based on the objectives, rather than the subjective point of view. Their way of thinking is very firm and relates to the physical matter of things. They don’t depend on the mind for existence. This makes their judgment unbiased or impartial. This is why most of the scientific papers or reports have a certain rule for the experiments and data collection not to be biased.

Their perspectives need to have strong reasons to back up their opinions for certain outcome they state. They pay attention to personal judgments; because it is what helps them elaborate methods and discoveries they made in their field. If one day, a new scientist came along and he/ she decides to give a subjective statement during a scientist conference meeting, he/ she will definitely be called out of the group because they have not successfully helped the group to decipher the missing piece to their scientific riddle. After all, science itself is the intellectual and practical activity.

It encompasses the systematic study of the structure and behavior of the physical and natural world through observation and experiment. Therefore, scientists' judgments are characterized by the methods and principles of science, meaning they have to avoid using the subjective nature of perspective since it does not relate to the physical and natural matter of things. In the end, its bias can lead to a scientific misconduct. We can tell that these two groups are in contrast of each other. One is very focused with the emotional judgment, while the other focuses more on the physical matter of the judgment.

They sum up the contrast of an unrealistic and realistic world. When combined together, these two perspectives used by artists and scientists will only create a new theorem of a new world of perspective, which can only be understood by the viewers/ observers, because once our brains are adjusted with one nature of perspective (either subjective or objective), we will find a hard time adjusting with other groups who have a different point of view to

the world. Perspective itself afterwards is complicated at its foundation.

Looking from different angles with our naked eyes can be tough sometimes.

But as feelings of emotions and factual existence correlate, possibilities of a better technique in different kinds of fields will be made. This new theory also along with other works in different forms of arts (music, theatre) and fields of research. Creating an unrealistic imagery through a realistic interpretation will enable the viewers to engage deeply into the artwork. But is it possible for scientists to apply the same theory in their field? So, is it possible for both artist and scientists to have a correlation between subjective and objective matter? After all, opposites do attract.